

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 and 40-41 are pending. No claim 39 was originally filed.

The specification is objected to based on formalities. The claims stand objected to for formalities.

Claims 26, 27, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention.

Claims 1-15, 26-34, and 35-38 and 40-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hogan et al. (U.S. Patent 5,799,156, "Hogan").

Claims 1-2 and 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Quinlan et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0130984, "Quinlan").

Claims 16-21 and 23-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Blevins et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0236780, "Blevins").

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Quinlan in view of Stewart et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,047,292, "Stewart").

Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Quinlan in view of Brandt et al. (U.S. Patent 6,377,993 "Brandt").

Claims 8-10, 12, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Quinlan in view of Blevins.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Quinlan in view of Watchel (U.S. Patent No. 6,847,974, "Watchel").

Claims 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Quinlan in view of Blevins.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Blevins in view of Rand (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0226142, "Rand").

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Blevins in view of Chandra, et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,058,389, "Chandra").

Claims 29-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hogan in view of Aldred et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,805, "Aldred").

Claims 33-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hogan in view of Aldred, Van Renesse et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,244, "Van Renesse").

Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ho (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0156814), "Ho"), in view of Chandra.

Claim 36 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ho in view of Chandra and Blevins.

Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ho in view of Chandra and Blevins.

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ho in view of Chandra and Hogan.

Claims 40-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ho in view of Chandra, Hogan and Aldred.

Claims 35-38 and 40-41 are being canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 14, 16, 23, 26-30, and 33 are being amended. Claims 42-43 being added. No new matter is being introduced by way of the amendments.

Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Objections to the Specification

Applicants have amended the specification to address the objections provided in the Office Action. Based on the below amendments to the Specification, Applicants respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn.

Please amend paragraph [004] of the specification as follows:

[004] The principles of the present invention relates to the transfer of data between disparate computing systems. More specifically, a bridge is provided that ~~facilitates~~ facilitates transfers between a message queue system and a business process component.

Please amend paragraph [0021] of the specification as follows:

[0021] Software to facilitate data transfers to a business component from a message queue, such as IBM's MQ SERIES, may possesses numerous interfaces, with one such interface connecting the server to a client, such as a Java application, while another interface may connect to the server through the use of the Java Message Service (JMS), a set of messaging interfaces defined by SUN MICROSYSTEMS of Santa Clara, California, to a client Java application that uses JMS. The introduction of the JMS standard application programming interface (API) for inter-client communication provided the opportunity for increased efficiency for messaging queues, as well as increase the ease of administration.

Please amend paragraph [0027] of the specification as follows:

[0027] These examples ~~illustrates~~ illustrate some of the types of queues that the message queue 16 may take in a given embodiment, and is not intended to be limiting. Regardless of the type of queue of message queue 16, the wrapper process 18 is operable to reduce the process load on the business component 12 by removing the requirement for the business component 12 to constantly query the message queue 16 directly to determine the existence of new messages. The wrapper process 18 assumes this function, enabling a publication/subscription notification

type of architecture to the queue connector 10. As the total volume of messages in the system increases, the removal of this requirement from the business component 12 may result in significant improvement in performance.

Please amend paragraph [0038] of the specification as follows:

[0038] While several embodiments have been provided in the present disclosure, it should be understood that the queuing connector to promote message servicing may be embodied in many other specific forms without departing from the spirit or scope of the present disclosure. The present examples are to be considered as illustrative and not restrictive, and the intention is not to be limited to the details given herein, but may be modified within the scope of the appended claims along with their full scope of equivalents. For example, the various elements or components may be combined or integrated in another system, and certain features may be omitted[,] or not implemented.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-10, 14, 23, 26-30, 33, 35, 26, 40, and 41 stand objected to due to informalities. Applicants have amended the above-identified claims based on the recommendations in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 26 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis problem as identified in the Office Action on page 5, bottom paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Claim 27 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis problem as identified in the Office Action on page 6, section 4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim 33 has been amended to correct the ambiguity as identified in the Office Action on page 6, section 5. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-15, 26-34, and 35-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 101

With regard to Claim 1, Applicants have amended the claim to recite, "the connector receiving messages from the first queue and communicating the messages from the first queue to the business component." Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 now includes a tangible result and, accordingly, complies with 35 U.S.C. § 101. Support for this amendment can be found at least in the specification, paragraph [0030], pages 11 and 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-15 depend from independent Claim 1 and, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

With regard to Claim 26, Applicants have amended Claim 26 to address providing both a tangible input and a tangible result. With regard to the tangible input, Applicants have amended Claim 26 to recite:

"a second component operable to communicate messages with a notification type queue."

With regard to the tangible results issue, Applicants have amended the claim to recite:

"a transaction component ... the transaction component deleting a message from one of the queues upon verification of receipt of the message by the business components from the queue from which the message originated." (underlines indicate amendments)

Support for these amendments can be found in the specification, at least in paragraph [0036] on page 14. As Applicants have provided both a tangible input and tangible results by way of the amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 26 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 101 and, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn. Claims 27-34, which depend from independent Claim 26, should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

With regard to the rejection of claims 35-38 and 40-41 under 35 U.S.C. are being canceled. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for these claims is now moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

With regard to the rejection of Claim 1 as being anticipated by Quinlan, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants recite in Claim 1,

“a first queue ... a wrapper ... and a connector in connection with the first queue via the wrapper.” (emphasis added)

Quinlan, by contrast, includes a user device 301 that includes an assistant 312 in communication with a data center 302 that includes a common store manager 321 and queues 322a and 322n. The Office Action on page 11, section 13, equates the user device 301 to the business component, assistant 312 to the wrapper, common store manager 321 to the connector, and queue 322a to the first queue. The configuration of these components shown in Quinlan, however, are not configured as claimed by Applicants. Specifically, the common store manager 321 (connector) is in direct communication with the queue 322a. Applicants' claim specifically recites that:

“a connector [is] in communication with the first queue via the wrapper.” (emphasis added)

Because Quinlan's common store manager (connector) does not communicate with the queue 322a (first queue) via the assistant 312 (wrapper), Quinlan does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention. In addition, the assistant 312 of Quinlan is located on a user device and not located within the data center. Inherently, this means that the common store manager 321 located in the data center 302 cannot communicate with the queue 322a in the data center 302 via the assistant 312 as it is located in the user device 301. Because Quinlan does not teach “a first queue ... a wrapper ... and a connector in connection with the first queue via the wrapper,” Quinlan fails to anticipate Applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-15, which depend from independent claim 1, should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

With regard to the rejection of claim 16 as being anticipated by Blevins, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants' amended claim 16, in particular, recites:

“providing a message to the message queue, the message being directed for delivery to the business component ... obtaining ... the message from the message queue; communicating the message to the business component; and verifying that the business component has received the message.” (emphasis added).

Blevins, by contrast, describes a system for client-side filtering of subscribed messages. FIG. 4 of Blevins shows a message broker that is configured to receive messages from a first JMS queue 400 and service 406 and publish the messages to a second JMS queue 418, service 420, or service 424. As shown in FIG. 4, the messages that are received by the message broker 410 from the JMS queue 400 and service 406 are published to other queues or services. However, as depicted in FIG. 4 of Blevins, the arrows showing the flow of messages to and from the broker are directional. It appears that there is no mechanism by which a message being received by a business component may be “verified” by a queue or service that delivered the message to the message broker 410 and the message broker 410 cannot determine that a queue or service has properly received a message that has been published. In other words, a message that is published and available to a queue or service (e.g., JMS queue 418, service 420, or service 424) does not provide any notification to the message broker 410 or JMS queue 400 or service 406 for verification that the business component has actually received the message. By way of exxample, if, for example, a message is published and available to the JMS queue 418, and the JMS queue 418 does not actually receive the message or receives only a partial message, the message broker 410, and consequently JMS queue 400 or service 406, has no way of verifying or determining that the JMS queue 418 has or has not successfully received the published message.

Additionally, for claim 16, the Office Action cites paragraph [0076] of Blevins for this element of the claim. The paragraph states (in part) “... If the JMS property “PRIORITY” is set to “YES” for a message, that message can be published to a priority service channel. Otherwise the message can be published to a “DEFAULT” service channel...” This is referring only to whether or not the message can be published to a priority service channel. There is no indication in paragraph [0076] of any verification that the business component received the message, only that the

message could be published to a specific location (i.e., the priority service channel). Accordingly, because Blevins fails to teach “verifying that the business component has received the message,” Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

Claims 17-25, which depend from independent Claim 16 should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 26 under U.S.C. § 102, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants’ amended claims invention recites, in part,

“a first component operable to communicate messages with a publication/subscription notification type queue ... and a second component operable to communicate messages with a notification type queue other than the publication/subscription type queue.” (emphasis added)

Hogan, by contrast, is a system and method for processing telephone calls and providing enhanced services. The Office Action cites to col. 41, lines 6-15 to show that a call route distributor (CRD) is in communication with a console queue when operator consoles are all being utilized. The console queue, however, does not appear to be a “publication/subscription notification type queue,” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 26. The console queue of Hogan appears to be nothing other than a conventional queue that stores information for a period of time and then releases the information in response to receiving a request from a device. The Applicants cannot locate a description within Hogan that would otherwise teach or suggest that the console queue operates as a “publication/subscription notification type queue,” as recited in Applicants’ claimed invention. Moreover, the term “subscriber,” as stated in Hogan, “is used to generally refer to users AA106 who are direct clients of call processing system AB102 and/or to customers AA110.” (col. 26, lines 28-30). Furthermore, the term “users” AA106 is described as “humans talking on the telephone.” (col. 23, lines 12-15). As it appears that Hogan uses the term “subscriber” to refer to a human user, Applicants respectfully disagree with the interpretation set forth in the Office Action that the queue is a publication/subscription notification type queue. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Hogan does not teach a publication/subscription notification type queue and, therefore, Hogan does not anticipate Applicants’ amended Claim 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 26 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

Claims 27-28, which depend from independent Claim 26, should be allowed for at least the same reasons. For example, with regard to Claim 27, which recites:

“a logging component operable to record information related to the messages ...”

Applicants have reviewed the cited portion of Hogan in col. 10, lines 1-10, and have been unable to find any elements that teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. The same holds true for Claim 28 which recites:

“the record includes a date and time associated with each of the messages.”

Applicants respectfully submit that, in addition to independent Claim 26 not being taught or suggested by Hogan, Claims 27 and 28 are further not taught or suggested by Hogan.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

With regard to the rejection of Claim 3 under U.S.C. § 103, Applicants have reviewed Stewart and determined that Stewart does not overcome the deficiencies of Quinlan and, therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 3 overcomes the rejection for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 4-5 under U.S.C. § 103, Applicants have reviewed Brandt and determined that Brandt does not overcome the deficiencies of Quinlan and, therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 4-5 overcomes the rejection for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 8-10, 12 and 14 under U.S.C. § 103, Applicants have reviewed Blevins and determined that Blevins does not overcome the deficiencies of Quinlan and, therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 8-10, 12 and 14 overcomes the rejection for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 11 under U.S.C. § 103, Applicants have reviewed Watchel and determined that Watchel does not overcome the deficiencies of Quinlan and, therefore,

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 11 overcomes the rejection for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 13 and 15 under U.S.C. § 103, Applicants have reviewed Blevins and determined that Blevins does not overcome the deficiencies of Quinlan and, therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 8-10, 12 and 14 overcomes the rejection for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 22 under U.S.C. § 103, Applicants have reviewed Rand and determined that Rand does not overcome the deficiencies of Quinlan and, therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 22 overcomes the rejection for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 25 under U.S.C. § 103, Applicants have reviewed Chandra and determined that Chandra does not overcome the deficiencies of Quinlan and, therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 25 overcomes the rejection for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 29-32 under U.S.C. § 103, Applicants have reviewed Aldred and determined that Aldred does not overcome the deficiencies of Hogan and, therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 29-32 overcomes the rejection for at least the same reasons as independent claim 26.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 33-34 under U.S.C. § 103, Applicants have reviewed Aldred and Van Renessee and determined that Aldred and Van Renessee do not overcome the deficiencies of Hogan and, therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 33-34 overcomes the rejection for at least the same reasons as independent claim 26.

The rejection of Claims 35-38 and 40-41 are moot in light of the cancellation of the claims.


CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action. If the Examiner feels a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Applicants believe no fee is due. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-2816, under Order No. 024777.0129PTUS from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: June 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Gary B. Solomon

Registration No.: 44,347
PATTON BOGGS LLP
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 3000
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 758-6611
Fax #: (214) 758-1550
Attorney for Applicants